

MAY 7 1917
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
LIBRARY

The Classical Weekly

VOL. X

MONDAY, MAY 7, 1917

No. 26

PRELIMINARY ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CONFERENCE

on

CLASSICAL STUDIES IN LIBERAL EDUCATION

to be held at

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

SATURDAY, JUNE 2, 1917

The Classical and Archaeological Departments are acting as a Committee of Arrangements in conjunction with a large Advisory Committee from all the other Departments of the University for a Conference on Classical Studies in Liberal Education to be held at Princeton on Saturday, June second. The addresses at the Conference are to be given by eminent speakers who, while favorable to classical studies, represent fields of interest outside of the Classics. The purpose of the conference is not only to emphasize the importance of classical studies as an essential element in the best liberal education along with mathematics, science, history, economics, philosophy, and modern literature, but also to show their practical value.

PROGRAMME

1. Morning Session - - - - 11:15 A.M.—1:15 P.M.
ALEXANDER HALL
2. Luncheon tendered by the University - - 1:30 P.M.
GRADUATE COLLEGE
3. Afternoon Session - - - - - 3—5 P.M.
ALEXANDER HALL

The Trend of Latin Teaching Today

**Is Toward the Reading of More Latin—Easy,
Connected Latin During the First Year**

FOR THIS PURPOSE

PEARSON'S ESSENTIALS OF LATIN

is better equipped than any other book. Its selections for sight reading are graded and are specified for use after every third lesson. These selections are really interesting stories, readable, human, sometimes humorous.

This book prepares pupils in a thorough way to read Caesar and lays a solid foundation for all subsequent work in Latin.

**IT IS IN USE IN MORE OF THE REPRESENTATIVE SCHOOLS—
PUBLIC AND PRIVATE—THAN ANY OTHER SIMILAR BOOK**

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

D'Ooge

is a name of prominence in the world of Latin instruction. The language is not a dead tongue under the sway of Professor D'Ooge's tuition. It becomes living, breathing, a very real force—essential to a complete understanding of our own English. This is why the publication of

A New Book

Caesar in Gaul

under the joint authorship of Professor Benjamin L. D'Ooge, Professor of Latin in the Michigan State Normal College, and Professor Frederic C. Eastman, Head of the Department of Latin in the State University of Iowa, is a matter of particular interest. In adequate and attractive form, it presents all the material requisite for the second year of Latin.

WRITE US FOR FURTHER DETAILS

GINN AND COMPANY

70 Fifth Avenue

NEW YORK

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. X

NEW YORK, MAY 7, 1917

No. 26

THE TAURIC IPHIGENIA AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Editorial

"To have seen a Grecian play is a great remembrance", wrote DeQuincey in 1845, after the performance at Edinburgh of the *Antigone* in English with Mendelssohn's new music, and, though in recent times, since the *Oedipus Tyrannus* was so superbly presented at Harvard in 1881, productions of Greek plays in English have become common and even popular, it is still a rare and memorable experience to hear the masterpieces of the Athenian drama creditably rendered in the original Greek. "It was cheap at the price of a journey to Siberia", DeQuincey added; and one who had traveled to Harvard in 1906 to see the masterpiece of Aeschylus performed, and to Dartmouth in 1910 to witness that of Sophocles was well repaid for a trip to Ann Arbor to see the favorite play of Euripides presented on March 29, 1917, by The Classical Club of the University of Michigan. It was a high service to the cause of the Classics that these young people rendered by giving this performance when the Michigan Schoolmaster's Club was holding its fifty-second meeting—an object-lesson as to the enduring beauty, inspiration, and human appeal of Greek literature, of more value than all the discussions, papers, addresses, and apologetics generally in which such meetings abound. A unique feature of the occasion was the presence of a large number of native Greeks from Detroit, Ypsilanti, and elsewhere, who were addressed in their own tongue by Professor C. L. Meader and gave a most enthusiastic response.

The play was cut down by somewhat over one-third, the chief cuts being made in the long Second Episode, with its great recognition scene, which in action entirely justified the admiration of Aristotle. The scenery was beautiful, an impressive Doric temple in a charming woodland setting; one would have welcomed a glimpse of the sea in the background, so large is the part it plays by suggestion in this romantic drama. The acting was done with great spirit and naturalness and feeling, and much credit is due to the young actors, who enjoyed the advantage of having women take the feminine rôles (as they did in the Stanford University production of the *Antigone* in 1902)—an advantage denied to the University of Pennsylvania in its performance of this play in 1903. The chief aim of the actors was to make the

drama interesting even to those—the great majority of their audience—who knew no Greek, and there can be no doubt as to the correctness and the success of their aim, even if it involved the sacrifice of some important things. A clearer and slower declamation of the lines might have bored most of the hearers (as was the case with the Dartmouth *Oedipus*); the Hellenist could follow the words at least as well as he could in an opera (and, after all, Greek tragedy was very much of an opera), while the barbarian had all the enjoyment of a beautiful moving picture, full of life and color, with the potent added charm of the strangely beautiful music.

The music indeed was the crowning distinction of this performance, for which it was especially composed. Professor Stanley had already shown his genius for adapting the Greek modes to modern ears in his exquisite settings of the lyrics in Percy Mackaye's *Sappho and Phaon* and in Euripides's *Alcestis*, which was played in English some years ago at the University of Michigan. In the *Iphigenia in Tauris* the Greek rhythms were closely followed (the *Kommos* with its difficult *dochmiacs* was wisely omitted), as they were in Mendelssohn's music, but here for the first time the Dorian, Phrygian, and Aeolian modes were freely employed by a master hand and modern harmonies were avoided. The music was rendered by a small choir of skilled singers behind the scenes, to the accompaniment of two flutes, two clarinets, a harp, and a small piano, sufficiently suggestive of ancient instruments, and, as it interpreted the varied feelings of chorus and spectators alike, its charming rhythmical surprises, its curious felicity and simple dignity, and above all its prevailing religious tone, now reminiscent of the Delphic Hymn to Apollo, now suggestive of a Church chorale, provided a new and vivid emotional experience. It proved, what many have always believed, that Greek music, like the other Greek arts, must have always been a thing of beauty, even judged by modern standards, and that the choral parts must always have been the chief feature of Greek tragedy. The chorus of Greek women, here increased to seventeen and relieved from the duty of singing, was certainly the chief actor, as always the chief element in the stage picture: the groupings and the movements and the softly-colored draperies were a constant pleasure to the eye, and the simple but stately dances wrought into visible harmony the words and the rhythms and the musical setting, a living exposition of the Greek genius for uniting all the arts in one supreme

sensuous and ethical appeal. The shape of the stage in the Hill Auditorium made an orchestra impossible: the altar (a genuine Roman *puteal*) was set to one side, and no attempt was made at strophic arrangement of dances. Nevertheless the chorus was more 'convincing' than that in the great open-air production of the Agamemnon at Harvard, and vastly more pleasing than that in Mr. Granville Barker's recent popular performances. This success was due largely, of course, to the fine music, but Professor Kenyon, who designed the dances and trained all the performers, is to be congratulated on his happy compromises between the ancient and the modern: some compromise has to be made, and it is far better to aim at the Greek spirit than at the archaeological letter. The concession, however, made to the modern theatre-goer of an interval before the last stasimon, with the chorus leaving the stage, though no curtain was lowered, seemed to be quite unnecessary.

The costumes, designed by Dr. Orma F. Butler, were all beautiful, and, though also something of a compromise, sufficiently true to what we know of antiquity, and were worn naturally as if they were actual clothes. Iphigenia, the Choregus, Orestes, Pylades, and the Messengers, in appearance, as well as in action, were very real persons, who would have satisfied the realistic spirit of Euripides. Even the Taurian barbarians were copied from Scythians as represented in the vase-paintings, and were far more effective than Mr. Barker's monsters; Thoas especially was a striking figure, not the burlesque that Mr. Barker made of him. And who that saw it will ever forget the splendid figure of Pallas Athena at the climax of the play, shown in a lightning-flash that gave unearthly glory to her white robes and shining helmet and aegis? We have been accustomed to think of the *deus ex machina* as a feeble Euripidean device for unraveling the plot, or rather for cutting its Gordian knot, and making an end of the play; but every experience with actual performances shows the effectiveness of such a climax, not only in a spectacular but also in a religious way. We no longer worship the Greek gods, nor perhaps did Euripides himself, but even a twentieth-century sceptic must have felt a thrill of almost pious awe at the resplendent apparition of the patron-saint of Athens, personifying all that Athens stood for in civilization and the arts, towering above the prostrate barbarians. At least we can guess what the Athenian spectator must have felt, and how the emotional and artistic effect of the drama culminated for him in its religious and patriotic appeal. It is true that the Greek theater had no such artifice as calcium light, but the southern sunlight must have served as well, and no machine was needed (though one was effectively employed in the Pennsylvania production) to present the sudden and startling apparition. As the Taurians cowered in the darkness of the coming storm, the goddess was flashed into view high on the right above a clump of shrubbery, a fitting symbol of the triumph of the Greek spirit over the powers of darkness

and barbaric force—a symbol that has not lost its significance even in these Greekless days!

HERBERT H. YEAMES.

CHRONOLOGY OF THE REIGNS OF THE CAESARS

Mommsen (*Staatsrecht*, II.2.802) states that dating events according to the year of an Emperor's reign was not recognized as the official method, even in the western part of the Empire. The old system of dating by consulships still continued to be practised officially.

When a year of an imperial reign does exceptionally appear, it is not probable that the computation is made from the day of an Emperor's accession, nor from the tenth of December, the day on which the tribunes assumed office, but rather from the beginning of the calendar year, January first. When that is done, it is still uncertain whether the partial year of the accession is omitted, or whether all of it is included.

In note 2 on the same page, after mentioning the passages of Dio, Suetonius, Philo and Tacitus bearing on the length of the reign of Tiberius, or giving a definite year in the reign, he says:

But one who computes in this way cannot possibly reckon the year 19. Aug. 14/15 as the first year of the reign of Tiberius.

And finally, in note 3, he cites Tacitus *Ann.* 4.1, and comments thus:

Here the Roman calendar year is meant, and it seems to be computed from Jan. 1, 15.

But an examination of the sources shows distinctly that the Roman historians regarded the actual day of accession as the beginning of an Emperor's reign, and computed the duration of the reign from that day. Nor is there any convincing evidence that any other system was used by them when the ordinal numeral appears denoting one of the intervening years of a reign. On the contrary, the sources show clearly that computations were not made from January first either preceding or following the accession. In fact, Tacitus is obviously referring to a general system when he says of the date of the accession of Vespasian (*Hist.* 2.79):

festinante Tiberio Alexandro, qui kalendis Iuliis sacramento eius legiones egit. Isque primus principatus dies in posterum celebratus, quamvis Iudaicus exercitus quinto nonas Iulias apud ipsum iurasset.

The evidence from inscriptions is very meager, and that from the papyri is limited to the usage in a small part of the Empire. So the historians are first taken as a basis, and the other sources are discussed separately after these.

Tiberius

Reigned from August 19, 14 to March 16, 37. Actual length of reign, 22 years, 6 months, 27 days.

Tacitus, *Ann.* 4.1: C. Asinio C. Antistio consulibus nonus Tiberio annus compositae rei publicae.

Suetonius, *Tib.* 73: obiit in villa Lucullana octavo et septuagesimo aetatis anno, tertio et vicesimo imperii, XVII. Kal. Ap. Cn. Acerronio Proculo C. Pontio Nigrino cons.

Tacitus, Ann. 6.50: Tiberius died septimum decimum Kal. Aprilis.

Eutropius, 7.11.3: hic tertio et vicesimo imperii anno . . . mortuus est.

Dio Cassius, 58.28.5: μετελλαξε τῇ ἑκτῇ καὶ εἰκοστῇ τοῦ Μαρτίου ἡμέρᾳ . . . ἔτη μὲν δύο καὶ εἰκοσι μῆνας δὲ ἐπτά καὶ ἡμέρας ἐπτά ἐμονάρχησε.

Philo, Leg. ad Gaium 21.141: τρία πρὸς τοῖς εἰκοσιν ἔτη γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης ἀναψάμενον . . . ibid. 37.298: ἐν γοῦν τρισὶ καὶ εἰκοσιν ἔτεσιν οἷς αὐτοκράτωρ ἐγένετο.

The ninth year actually began August 19, 22. Asinius and Antistius were consuls in 23.

The twenty-third year began August 19, 36. Dio is in error to the extent of twenty days in the date of the death of Tiberius.

Computing from January 1, 15, we find that the ninth year began January 1, 23, the twenty-third year began January 1, 37.

Either system can be maintained, except that the error of Philo is greater according to Mommsen's system.

If the computation begins with January 1, 14, the ninth year would begin January 1, 22, the twenty-third on January 1, 36, both of which are impossible.

Dio Cassius and Philo show that they are reckoning from the exact day of accession.

Caligula

Reigned from March 16, 37 to January 24, 41.

Suetonius, Cal. 59: vixit annis viginti novem, imperavit triennio et decem mensibus diebusque octo.

Eutropius, 7.12.4: interfectus est anno . . . imperii tertio, mense decimo, dieque octavo.

Dio Cassius, 59.30: Γάιος μὲν δὴ ταῦτα ἐν ἔτεσι τρισὶ καὶ μηνὶ ἐννέα ἡμέραις τε ὀκτὼ καὶ εἰκοσι πράξας.

Suetonius, Cal. 58: Caligula died VIII. Kal. Feb.

Computing from January 1, 38, we should make the fourth year begin January 1, 41.

Computing from January 1, 37, we should make the fourth year begin January 1, 40, and would end before the death of Caligula.

Obviously all three are computing from the exact date of accession.

Claudius

Reigned from January 24, 41 to October 13, 54.

Suetonius, Claud. 45: excessit III. Id. Octob. Asinio Marcello Acilio Aviola coss. sexagesimo quarto aetatis, imperii quarto decimo anno.

Eutropius, 7.13.5: is vixit annos IV et LX, imperavit XIV.

Tacitus, Ann. 12.69: tunc medio diei tertium ante Idus Octobris (for death of Claudius).

The actual fourteenth year of Claudius would run from January 24, 54 to January 24, 55.

Computing from January 1, 42 we should make the fourteenth year begin January 1, 55, i. e. after the death of Claudius.

Computing from January 1, 41, we should make the fourteenth year begin January 1, 54.

The historians are computing either from the actual date of accession or from January 1, 41.

Nero

Reigned from October 13, 54 to June 9, 68.

Eutropius, 7.15.3: obiit tricesimo et altero aetatis anno, imperii quarto decimo.

Xiphilinus, 186: ἐβίω δὲ ἔτη τριάκοντα καὶ μῆνας ἐννέα, ἀφ' ὧν ἤρξεν ἔτη δεκατρία καὶ μῆνας ὀκτὼ.

Zonaras, 11.13: οὕτω κατὰ τὸν Ἰούλιον ἐτελεύτησε μῆνα βίους ἔτη τριάκοντα πρὸς μηνὶ πέντε καὶ ἡμέραις εἰκοσιν, ἀφ' ὧν ἔτη τρισκαίδεκα καὶ μῆνας ὀκτὼ δυοῖν ἡμερῶν δέοντας.

The date of the accession of Nero is mentioned also in C. I. L. 6.2041 v. 9; Seneca, Apocol. 2; Suetonius, Nero 8; Dio Cassius, 60.34.3.

Tacitus, Ann. 14.53.2 (Seneca addresses Nero in 62, the consulship of Publius Marius and Lucius Asinius): quartus decimus annus est, Caesar, ex quo spei tuae admotus sum, octavus, ut imperium obtines.

The numerals are slightly wrong in both Xiphilinus and Zonaras. In Xiphilinus, Reimar substitutes πέντε for ἐννέα, accepted by Boissevain. In Zonaras, Ἰούλιον should replace Ἰούλιον, and Boissevain thinks πέντε καὶ εἰκοσι should be read for εἰκοσι).

Computing from January 1, 55, we find that the eighth year began January 1, 62, and the fourteenth year January 1, 68.

Computing from January 1, 54, we should make the eighth year begin January 1, 61, and the fourteenth January 1, 57, which are impossible dates.

The statements of Eutropius and Tacitus would fit either a computation from the exact date, or one from January, 1. 55.

Obviously Xiphilinus and Zonaras are computing from the exact date.

Vespasian

Reigned from July 1, 69 to June 23, 79.

Tacitus, Hist. 2.79: cited above.

Suetonius, Vesp. 6.3: Tiberius Alexander praefectus Aegypti primus in verba Vespasiani legiones adegit Kal. Iul., qui principatus dies in posterum observatus est; Iudaicus deinde exercitus V. Idus Iul. apud ipsum iuravit.

Eutropius, 7.20.2: extinctus est . . . annum agens . . . imperii nonum et diem septimum.

Xiphilinus, 210.26: ἔζησε δὲ ἔτη ἐννέα καὶ ἑξήκοντα καὶ μῆνας ὀκτὼ, ἐμονάρχησε δὲ ἔτη δέκα ἡμερῶν ἔξ δέοντα. καὶ τούτου συμβαίνει ἐνιαυτὸν τε καὶ εἰκοσιν ἡμέρας ἀπὸ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ Νέρωνος μέχρι τῆς τοῦ Οἰσπασσιανοῦ ἀρχῆς διελθεῖν.

Suetonius, Vesp. 24: Vespasian died VIII. Kal. Iul. consulatu suo nono.

Obviously all the historians are computing from an exact date, that of accession. They differ in the length of reign from the fact that it was difficult to set a day on which the reign began.

Tacitus and Suetonius state the general principle of the method of computing the length of a reign.

Titus

Reigned from June 23, 79 to September 13, 81.

Zonaras, 11.18: the eruption of Vesuvius occurred ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῆς ἡγεμονίας αὐτοῦ ἔτει.

Suetonius, Tit. 11: excessit in eadem qua pater villa Id. Sept. post biennium ac menses duos diesque XX quam successerat patri.

Eutropius, 7.22: perii post biennium et menses octo, dies viginti, quam imperator erat factus.

Xiphilinus, 211.29: δύο τε γὰρ ἔτη μετὰ τοῦτο καὶ μῆνας δύο ἡμέρας τε ἐλκοσιν ἔζησεν.

Xiphilinus, 216.23: ἤρξε δὲ δύο ἔτη καὶ μῆνας δύο ἡμέρας τε ἐλκοσιν, ὡς προείρηται.

All the historians compute the length of reign from the day of accession. In Eutropius 'two' should be substituted for 'eight' in the number of months.

The eruption of Vesuvius occurred in 79, and, if one should compute from January 1, 80, the first year would not yet have begun.

Domitian

Reigned from September 13, 81 to September 18, 96. Duration of his reign, 5 years, 5 days.

Xiphilinus, 226.8: Δομντιανὸς δὲ ἔζησε μὲν ἔτη τέσσαρα καὶ τεσσαράκοντα καὶ μῆνας δέκα καὶ ἡμέρας δέ καὶ ἐλκοσιν, ἐπομόρφησε δὲ ἔτη πεντεκαίδεκα καὶ ἡμέρας πέντε.

Eutropius, 7.23.6: interfectus est . . . anno . . . imperii quinto decimo.

Suetonius, Dom. 17.3: occisus est XIII. Kal. Octb. anno aetatis quadragensimo quinto, imperii quinto decimo.

Computing from January 1, 82, we find that the fifteenth year began January 1, 96.

Computing from January 1, 81, we find that the fifteenth year began January 1, 95, which is impossible.

Suetonius and Xiphilinus are in accord on the date of the death of Domitian. But Eutropius and Suetonius both state that he died in the fifteenth year of his reign, which is possible only if one compute from January 1, 82. Either they are computing in accordance with the system indicated by Mommsen, or they have simply made a blunder.

It has appeared above that Suetonius must have computed from the exact date of accession, even when he uses the ordinal numeral, as in the case of Claudius.

The same must be said of Eutropius, from his accounts of the reigns of Caligula and Claudius.

The conclusion must be that they have erroneously used fifteenth for sixteenth in computing the reign of Domitian.

Summary

The general method of dating from the exact day of accession is confirmed by Tacitus and Suetonius.

In all cases except that of Claudius the historians give the precise duration of each reign.

When the ordinal numeral is used,

A computation from January 1 next following an accession would convict the historians of error in the cases of Claudius, Vespasian and Titus.

A computation from January 1 preceding an accession would convict the historians of error in the cases of Tiberius, Caligula, Nero and Domitian.

A computation from the exact date of accession would convict Suetonius and Eutropius of error in the case of Domitian, but evidence has been offered to show that they have in that instance simply made a blunder.

Seventeen passages in Josephus, bearing on the chronology of the Emperors from Augustus to Nero, are here omitted, in view of the uncertainty (Niese, *Zur Chronologie des Josephus*, Hermes 28.208 ff.) whether

Josephus computes from the actual beginning of an Emperor's reign or from Nisan 1, the beginning of the Hebrew year. As that is a question of Hebrew, rather than of Roman, chronology, it is not here discussed, although it might be argued plausibly that even Josephus computes from the actual beginning of imperial reigns.

From inscriptions practically no help can be derived. A Latin inscription found at Massilia, dedicated by three members of a local priestly office, in honor of Germanicus, bears the date (C. I. L. 12.406): Anno V Ti. Caes(aris Aug.). Since Germanicus died on October 11, 19 A. D., is it difficult to see on what basis the years are counted. It is suspected that this inscription came from the East where the system of dating by imperial years was in vogue, but it is not clear in what part of the east it would fit. It has been pointed out by Mommsen (*Staatsrecht*, II.2.803) that in Syria the Actian era was in use, whereby the period from the day of accession to September 30 was regarded as the first year of the reign. Thus the time from August 19, 14 A. D. to September 30 of the same year would be counted as the first year of the reign of Tiberius. In that case the fifth year of Tiberius would extend from October 1, 17 to September 30, 18, which is impossible in this inscription. If one of the three methods mentioned at the beginning of the paper was used, it could be only that by which the computation was made from January 1 next following the actual accession. But such a method is not known anywhere in the East. In Egypt two Latin inscriptions are found (C. I. L. 3.33 and 34), dated in the second and third years of Titus. The first was composed on November 11, 79, and the second on January 7, 81. Since Titus came to the throne on June 23, 79, his first year was computed in Egypt as extending from that day until the day before Thoth 1 = August 29 of the same year, his second year from August 29, 79 to August 28, 80, and his third year from August 29, 80 to August 28, 81. Titus died on September 10, 81, after reigning a little over two years, but he would then be in his fourth year, according to the Egyptian calendar. Patient search has not revealed other Latin inscriptions showing the year of imperial power.

In the Greek inscriptions there are several from Egypt, revealing the same system as that described above. One is dated in the first year of Titus (Cagnat et Lafaye, 1242), and four are dated in the third year (1043; 1098; 1151; 1332). There is also one which is dated in the ninth year of Tiberius (1150), which Cagnat and Lafaye assign to the year 21. The death of Augustus occurred on August 19, but the news of it did not reach Egypt until the next month. As the Egyptian year began on August 29, the few days between the actual day of the accession of Tiberius and the new year were omitted, and the first year of Tiberius was counted from Thoth 1, or August 29, 44, to August 28, 15 (Wilcken, *Archiv* 1.153). Therefore, the ninth year of Tiberius would extend from August 29,

22, to August 28, 23, and Cagnat and Lafaye are considerably in error in the date assigned to the inscription. From Cyprus (Cagnat et Lafaye, 933) comes a very perplexing one. It is dated the thirty-first year of the tribunician power, and the sixteenth of the reign, of Tiberius. The thirty-first year of the tribunician power fell in 29. A computation from the actual day of accession would place the sixteenth year from August 19, 29 to August 18, 30, and this may be correct. According to the Syrian system the sixteenth year would extend from October 1, 28 to September 30, 29, and this also is possible. It could not be computed from the first of January following the accession.

The papyri make it certain that the system described above as that current in Egypt was in general use. Only a few of the more interesting situations will be mentioned. Caligula ascended the throne on March 16, 37, and died January 24, 41, so that his reign lasted but little more than three years and ten months. And yet a papyrus (B. G. U. 787) is dated in the fifth year, which, according to Egyptian computation, would be from August 29, 40 to his death. Two (Oxy. 289, II and 899) are dated in the second year of Galba, so that, although Galba reigned only six months, he was in his second year at the time of his assassination. Several are dated from the third year of Titus (e. g. Fayum 191; Oxy. 289, I; 958). These are sufficient to show the Egyptian method, which had at least the merit of uniformity.

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE.

R. W. HUSBAND.

REVIEWS

Socrates: Master of Life. By William Ellery Leonard.
Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company
(1915). Pp. 118. \$1.25.

In a prefatory note the author advises his readers that the present study is a reprint, with slight variations, of a work composed many years ago as a companion to his *Poet of Galilee*, in an effort to reinterpret, imaginatively yet critically, an ancient personality that has too often become for the scholar merely one or another technical problem, and for the general reader too often but a name or an anecdote.

The volume embraces, besides its main portion, a selected bibliography, a brief table of contents, and an introductory study of fifteen pages. The main portion deals with Old Athens, The Son of Sophroniscus, The Thinker, A Personality, Influences.

In the introductory part the author declares that Socrates as a religious leader concerns us as a soul interested in the salvation of man, as a life witnessing the laws of the spirit, as a central personality of a great people, as an historic contrast to other more specifically religious types.

The author follows the conservative path of admitting the evidence from the *Memorabilia* of Xenophon (though to him it adds one element of complication in the interpretation of Socrates), and from Plato's

dialogues, especially the so-called Socratic dialogues. Probably there will never be unanimity among scholars respecting the relative value of Xenophon and Plato for the understanding of Socrates. But that the real portrait lies somewhere in the composite of the sketches given us by these two authors is, it appears, beyond question. It is not, however, necessary to conclude with the author that "if the Platonic Socrates is the real Socrates, Plato himself as an original thinker vanishes from the history of philosophy". For what must needs prevent a philosopher while himself passing through a well-defined development of logic from seeing the greatness of, and acknowledging his indebtedness to, his master?

In the chapter on Old Athens we have a picture of the "more glorious Athens" of Pericles. The greatness of her architecture, the disasters of the Peloponnesian war, the political turmoil, the slowly developing philosophic genius of the great people, pass before us in rapid review. The organising of social and political clubs, the meetings for conversation and discussion, the elements of awakening genius later manifest in the so-called philosophic schools, and visiting teachers of philosophy, were all present in the Athens into which Socrates made his adventure. Here were celebrated the Orphic and the Eleusinian mysteries. Here was a fertile soul-soil in which the seeds of intellectual emancipation were to be sown and from which a rich harvest of philosophic thought was to be reaped. At precisely this point did mysticism make its way into Greek philosophy, and mysticism has worked its (to Mr. Leonard) baneful results in the history of thinking. It may not be apparent to science, but there is a distinction between superstition and religion. And the mysticism of religion does not of necessity make religion superstition. We venture the assertion that a situation in which we have fifty Churches in an American metropolis "simultaneously petitioning heaven for the conversion of a recalcitrant mayor" is not of necessity an instance of superstition, and that Socrates, for his day, was not excessively superstitious when he prayed, 'Beloved Pan . . . give me beauty in the inward soul'. Cicero is to be commended for an effort, in *De Natura Deorum* 2.28, to distinguish even in his time between religion and superstition. We also do well, no doubt, to make a distinction.

"The ancestral clan of the enlightened" was represented at Athens not only by the Sophists and the speculative philosophers, but also by Thucydides, the rationalistic historian, and even by Herodotus, who had "occasional rationalistic suspicions". Euripides, the sceptic, was enjoying great popularity. Aristophanes, although handling the gods in "reckless irreverence", was still not a sceptic, thus bearing witness to the popular conservatism which is last to yield to the progressive ideas of advanced enlightenment.

The author now brings before us Socrates, a character of humble birth and of lowly occupation; his possible acquaintance with Parmenides, Zeno, Anaxagoras and

Protagoras, and the likely effect of the doctrines of these teachers upon the youthful Socrates; his life as a soldier seeing hard service at Potidea, at Delium, and at Amphipolis; his career as a civilian, and his senatorship, in which he championed the cause of justice, even when he was threatened with imprisonment and death. Then comes a glimpse of Socrates's daily life, his habitual appearance at the favorite resorts of youth, his daily intercourse with the citizens of Athens, his daily self-examination, and cross-examination of others, his cosmopolitan spirit, and his easy manner in the presence of princes and peasants alike. Here is seen the "professor of the art of wretchedness", the "unwashed guide of souls", the "Silenus-face", who said of himself that "if beauty be an adaptation to ends, then his own capacious mouth and nose and eyes made him the most beautiful of mankind". His domestic life also was intended to increase his self-mastery.

In the burlesque on Socrates by Aristophanes in the *Clouds*, enacted in the Dionysiac theater in 423 B. C., is found, the author believes, the beginning of criticism against Socrates which, many years later, was to work his ruin. The chain of evidence is rather slender but the claim may well be true.

Socrates The Thinker now comes before us. The Milesians, the Eleatics, Heraclitus, the early Pythagoreans, Empedocles had lived and gone. Democritus, a Thracian contemporary of Socrates, was teaching "a mechanism of nature . . . which . . . is the physics and chemistry of to-day. . . ." "These courageous efforts to master experience were all primarily directed outward". But in all this the mind of the world is waking to self-consciousness, the process of introspection is beginning in earnest. Mystery offsets atomism. Man is the measure of all things. Speculation and absolute scepticism are in the air. At this point the mature Socrates arrives on the scene. As a thinker, however, Socrates had no particular interest in world-systems, no theory to advance about the world-all and the be-all, but his "interest was in men and his aim to reform men". His was the mission to awake men from their mental stupor and from their moral lethargy.

At this stage the author well points out the possibility of misrepresenting the case by distorting the chronology. Gorgias, Anaxagoras and Protagoras, all in Athens, were capably dealing with many problems which were pressing for solution. Philosophy was not stagnant, waiting for someone to trouble the waters so that thought-weary souls might step into the pool and be healed of mental maladies, nor was the moral world waiting, unnerved and flaccid, for some new elixir of life to be infused into its veins that it might really live

and move. But Socrates alone made truth and righteousness the foundation of life and thought.

In the next place, Socrates revealed himself as a thinker in his method. Dialectic was a keen weapon, often used by the Sophists to the discomfiture of an antagonist, but Socrates wielded that weapon for constructive and not for destructive ends. By securing from his hearer the acceptance of one proposition after another, Socrates would bring his interlocutor or opponent face to face with himself, and thus hoped to fructify the mind of his hearer. The testimony of Aristotle³ (*Metaphysica* 1.6.3), however, that Socrates discovered inductive discourse and the definition of general terms, must, the author thinks, be taken with considerable allowance, and he rather scouts the notion that it will ever be possible to square the thought and the service of Socrates with Aristotle's account of him (page 79). A more serious difficulty, perhaps, is found in Aristotle's statement that Socrates considered the virtues knowledges⁴. But in what, in contemporary thought, did virtue consist? For the Sophists it meant efficiency in family affairs, in state-craft, or in any craft, and was a teachable and communicable art. Socrates himself distinguished (Plato, *Phaedo* 82A) two kinds of goodness, philosophic goodness which depends upon the intellect and is teachable, and popular goodness which depends upon habit, and is good only in so far as it participates in intellectual goodness. In other words, there was in Socrates's mind a two-fold idea of goodness: common goodness which, like our experience through sense, is inconstant and variable, and true goodness, which must be positive and invariable. Furthermore, goodness is not an art. The very constitution of the soul, *τὰς* and *κίνητος*⁵, makes possible the presence of goodness, which can result only from knowledge and not from experience. The outward manifestation of this inner constitution of the soul appears in the ideal State. Wisdom, courage, and sobriety, harmonized by justice and unified by integrity, are severally represented in the various classes of citizens in an ideal State. These in turn reveal the true polity of the individual soul. In this theory Socrates is much nearer an appreciable and consistent truth than was Pythagoras in laying down the theory that virtue is number⁶. Undoubtedly Socrates saw the full completion of his theory of virtue and knowledge in the wise man. So we cannot agree that "it is impossible to square the thought and service of Socrates entirely with Aristotle's report", giving reasonable latitude, of course, for the word "entirely". Yes, Socrates was an incorrigible, utilitarian, rationalistic idealist, which amounts to saying that he was no utilitarian rationalist

³Compare *ibid.* 11.4.4.

⁴*Nicomachean Ethics* 6.13.5; *Magna Moralia* 1.1.7.

⁵Gorgias, 504 A ff. As Burnet points out, Socrates's theory of virtue is the exact counterpart of his theory of knowledge and reality. The cause of anything 'becoming' or ceasing to be is found in its participation or ceasing to participate in an intelligible 'form'. So true virtue has being only when each act is referred by reasoning to its true cause.

⁶Aristotle, *Magna Moralia* 1.1.6.

at all. Noble uses are begotten of noble ideals, and noble ideals are intelligible forms which stand to noble actions as their *raison d'être*.

When this is once settled for the inner life of the individual, outward matters become clear. Friendship, society and politics, the State, all are the result of proper activities of the individual expressing himself in the terms of fellow-relationships.

The author speaks of Socrates as a personality, as an incessant intellect, a pathfinder without a map, possessed of self-reliance in thought and in the art of living, gregarious and loquacious, possessed too of a keen sense of humor, and of unique balance of soul, of moral grandeur such that what he deemed good we deem good. He was the true superman.

The "influences" of this man, the author points out, were felt chiefly by his immediate acquaintances. His greatest influence after his death was, of course, upon Plato. The great master gave his great disciple the literary form of the dialogue, the impulse to recognize reality in ideas, and a model for conduct in his own personality. He stimulated scientific thought and methods of inquiry which took systematic form in the masterful genius of Aristotle. With much truth may it be said that

Socrates is the fountain head not only of scientific ethics but of all metaphysical systems in which the point of departure is a theory of knowledge rather than a theory of being.

In this little volume, we believe, Professor Leonard has done a distinct service in bringing to modern readers a somewhat new interpretation of the great Socrates.

WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON
COLLEGE.

ROBERT B. ENGLISH.

Studies in Magic from Latin Literature. By Eugene Tavenner. New York: Columbia University Press (1916). Pp. x + 155. \$1.25 net.

The purpose of this Columbia University dissertation, as stated in its Preface, is "first, to furnish a general introduction to Roman magic, especially as reflected in Latin literature; and then, to add, as a specimen of detailed study, a chapter on Roman prophylactic magic".

To this beginning the author hopes later to add chapters on such subjects as Magic and Curative Medicine, The Number Three in Magic, and Spitting as an Act of Magic. The investigation is limited to Latin literature from the beginning through the third century of our era, excluding epigraphical and archaeological material and omitting Greek literature save "when it bears directly upon our discussion". These limits have, of course, been imposed by the necessity of keeping a doctor's dissertation within reasonable compass, and are evidently well understood by the writer to be artificial, but for the general reader, with a feeble command of the sources, yet interested in the subject of magic among the Romans, a limitation which practically excludes any treatment of Vergil's eighth Eclogue because that poem was borrowed from Theocritus (page 28, note 142) and which admits the evidence of Livy and Pliny while excluding that of Dionysius and Plutarch must be regarded as unfortunate. Again, the elimination of epigraphical and archaeological material has had comparatively little effect in the part thus

far published, but, should the work be extended to include the remainder of Roman magic, the important subjects of the *defixio* and the evil eye would require that such material be included.

These necessary qualifications once made, it must be said that Professor Tavenner has done his work with care and good sense. He first discusses the meaning of *magus* and *magia* and defines magic (7) as "an act based on medicine, astrology, and religion, whereby man attempts to control the gods and thereby to control natural phenomena in accordance with his own selfish desires". Its source and antiquity in Italy are treated and the opinions of Latin authors in regard to it are passed in a detailed review (26-60). Chapter II (61-123) deals with the relations between medical magic and religion and scientific medicine; with amulets, their uses, materials, and purposes; with prophylactic means other than amulets; and with the theory of *sympathia* underlying prophylactic magic in general.

So much for the plan of the work. A few questions of detail may here be raised. Whether "Studies . . . from . . ." is a happy phrase for the title seems at least open to dispute. In dealing with Horace (38) the work of Belli, *Magia e Pregiudizii in Q. Orazio Flacco* (1895), might be cited. On page 39 Dr. Tavenner is inclined to emphasize Horace's weakness for magic. Yet (1) an entire rationalist in such matters might like, from curiosity, to visit the fakers of the circus; (2) *Carmina* 1.11.1-3 need only imply Leucnoe's belief in the *Babylonii numeri*, not any belief on the part of the poet; and (3) in the reference to the evil eye (Epp. 1.14.37-38) it must be remembered that Horace is writing to his *vilicus* and is using an argument calculated to appeal to him. On pages 44-45, in the discussion of the relation of Apuleius to magic, reference should have been made to the elaborate work of Abt, *Die Apologie des Apuleius von Madaura und die Antike Zauberei* (1908). The belief of Lentulus (page 49, note 259) that he would be the third Cornelius to reign at Rome hardly falls in the sphere of magic. The attitude of Pliny the Elder toward magic practices may perhaps be more easily understood if we admit the view of Detlefsen, quoted by Schanz, *Geschichte der Römischen Litteratur*, 2.2¹ (1913), 489, that Pliny's interests were essentially for the practical rather than for the truly scientific. On the subject of knots (63) reference might well be made to Heckenbach, *De Nuditate Sacra Sacrisque Vinculis* (1911), especially Part 2, and for incubation (65) the important treatise of Deubner, *De Incubatione* (1900), should be noted, as perhaps also the work of Mary Hamilton, *Incubation* (1906). Though the general principle of *sympathia* in magic is well established, its application to individual cases is often difficult, and probably not all readers will accept without misgiving the explanations for the magic use of cherry seeds (115, 122), or of the milk teeth of boys (117). On page 122 it might be suggested that the notion of the keen sight of dragons is probably connected with the etymology of the word (from *δράκων*). The writer might have cited more carefully the names of authors of encyclopedia articles (e. g. in Chapter I, notes 32, 38, 40, 80, 96, 226). In the Selected-Bibliographical Index (125-127) one misses the important articles of Hubert (in Daremberg et Saglio, s. v. *Magia*; though Dr. Tavenner cites this on pages 8 and 17), and Riess (in Pauly-Wissowa, s. v. *Aberglaube*, much of it covering similar ground to that traversed by Dr. Tavenner). That of K. F. Smith in Hastings's *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* 8 (1916), 269-289, probably appeared too late to be used. For comparative purposes one would also gladly see in the list such works as von Hovorka v. Kronfeld's *Vergleichende Volksmedizin* (2 volumes, 1908-1909), and Seligmann's

Der Böse Blick (2 volumes, 1910), while on the relations between magic and religion Toy's Introduction to the History of Religions (1913) might well have been cited.

But these matters, like a half dozen minor misprints, are but details. The work as a whole shows extensive and thoughtful reading in the authors and maturity of judgment in presenting the results obtained. It is to be hoped that the author will continue it to include the other departments of magic and that in his more comprehensive work he may be able to enlarge somewhat his field of observation so as to admit some of the rich illustrative material from other sources, especially Greek, that would add much to the value of the work.

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS. ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE.

A Study of Archaism in Euripides. By Clarence Augustus Manning. New York: Columbia University Press (1916). Pp. 98. \$1.25.

Euripides was so clearly the poet of the future rather than of the past that we are apt to notice his innovations in the form and the content of tragedy and overlook his debt to his predecessors. This is especially true of his relation to Aeschylus, for the barbed shafts of Aristophanic humor have left an ineradicable impression of the antagonism between the two poets. In recent years, however, resemblances have been noted, and one modern scholar (E. Schwartz, *Charakterköpfe aus der Antiken Literatur*, 34) has declared that Euripides, and not Sophocles, is the true successor of Aeschylus. Starting with this thesis O. Krause, in his dissertation *De Euripide Aeschyli Instauratore* (Jena, 1905), noted (1) certain classes of words which are common to Aeschylus and Euripides, but which rarely or never occur in Sophocles, (2) similarities, especially in language, in the treatment of the same myths by the two poets, and (3) features in the structure and the content of his dramas in which Euripides differs from Sophocles but agrees with Aeschylus. Dr. Krause concluded (238) that, while Sophocles, as exponent of the tragic art, was related to Aeschylus in much the same way as Plato was related to Socrates, or Aristotle to Plato, Euripides is not the successor, but rather the 'reviver' of Aeschylus. It might be thought that this bulky monograph (in size equal to about three of the average German doctoral dissertations) had exhausted the material. But Dr. Manning, whose objective is similar to that of Dr. Krause in the third part of the latter's dissertation, has done, in his own Columbia University dissertation, an independent piece of work which either covers new ground or else, in a few cases, treats the same features in a new way and with different results.

The present study considers "some of the ways in which Euripides . . . set himself to restore and revivify old forms of tragedy and older usages, and in which he carried on the tradition of Aeschylus". The first three chapters deal with structural principles (The Structure of the Drama, 1-26; The Prologues and Epilogues, 27-30; The Parodos, 31-43); the next three discuss the use of certain meters (The Iambic Speeches of the Chorus, 44-50; The Anapaest, 51-55; the Trochaic Tetrameter, 56-63); and the last three touch upon Description (64-67), Dreams (68-72), and The Religion of Euripides (his attitude towards Dionysus, Apollo and Athena, 73-96). A brief bibliography concludes the work. In each chapter the author compares Euripides with the other two tragic poets, and concludes that he is following Aeschylus rather than Sophocles. Archaism in the stricter sense—the revival of features of pre-Aeschylean tragedy is seen, he maintains, in the loose or epic structure of the tragedies of Euripides (26), in his use of tetrameters (63), and in his admiration for Dionysus and his hatred of Apollo (92).

Dr. Manning has collected much interesting material. His discussion of the structure of the extant Greek tragedies is stimulating, and the metrical analyses of the parodoi (Chapter III) and of the use of anapaests by the three tragic poets (Chapter V) will be found useful for reference. We can agree with him that in the features of tragedy which he has studied Euripides shows a greater likeness to Aeschylus than to Sophocles. But it is well to bear in mind some considerations which should have due weight in determining how far we can admit that Euripides was consciously archaistic.

In the first place, it was a common tendency of the Greeks to adopt features that had been discovered or invented by their predecessors and even by their contemporaries. It is therefore natural that Euripides should have followed Aeschylus in many respects, just as in the speech of the messenger and in the juristic debate he was developing features of the Sophoclean tragedy. Before we can be sure that he took Aeschylus as his model we need to know his debt to Sophocles in other respects, and likewise the debt of Sophocles to Aeschylus. And we cannot ascertain this conclusively so long as we possess only about one-tenth of the dramas which the three poets composed.

Again, mere similarity does not always imply imitation. For example, because the Hippolytus falls into a three-fold division, it is not necessary to conclude with Dr. Manning (13) that Euripides took an 'epic', i. e. Aeschylean, type of the drama as his model. The divisions of the Hippolytus (I. Prologos; II. the fate of Phaedra; III. the fate of Hippolytus) may be paralleled by those of the Antigone (I. Prologos; II. the fate of Antigone; III. the fate of Creon).

Furthermore, the dramatic situation often determines the attitude of the poet. That Apollo is clearly in the wrong in the Ion is no more reason for the inference that Euripides hated Apollo than is the attitude of Prometheus towards Zeus in the Prometheus Bound evidence that Aeschylus hated the father of the gods. For political reasons an Athenian poet might well be opposed to the influence of Delphi (91), but the Alcestis shows that, if the plot so required, Apollo might be presented in a more favorable light.

Finally, the individuality and aims of the poet constitute a sufficient explanation of some of the striking characteristics of his dramas. Euripides cared more for the tragic effect than for the artistic beauty of his drama as a whole. This, in the opinion of the reviewer, sufficiently accounts for the loose structure of his tragedies, the introduction of the extraneous, the stereotyped prologues and many other features, without reference to the influence of Aeschylus.

These considerations should make us somewhat cautious in accepting Dr. Manning's theory of archaism in all its implications, but they do not detract from the real value of his study. This consists, like that of Professor Teuffelsdröckh's famous work, in the extent to which it "excites us to self-activity, which is the best effect of any book".

The bibliography is not intended to be complete. A reference to Diederich's *Mutter Erde* would have strengthened the reasons for postulating archaism in the attitude of Euripides towards *Xθῶν* (71, 89), and Professor Goodell's article on Structural Variety in Attic Tragedy, in *The Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 41 (1910), 71-98, deserved mention in Chapters I-III. Dr. Manning has used Henning, *De Tragicorum Narrationibus* (Göttingen, 1910), but does not name the equally important dissertation of Rassow, *Quaestiones Selectae De Euripidis Nuntiorum Narrationibus* (Greifswald, 1883), and that of Fischl, *De Nuntiis Tragicis* (Vienna, 1910).

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT.

SAMUEL E. BASSETT.

For Textbooks Next School Year

THE LAKE LATIN SERIES

SCOTT'S ELEMENTARY LATIN
the Teachable Beginners' Book

WALKER'S CAESAR
Four Book Edition
Seven Book Edition

**BEESON & SCOTT'S SECOND LATIN
BOOK**

JOHNSTON & KINGERY'S CICERO
Six Oration Edition
Ten Oration Edition

KNAPP'S VERGIL

All the "readers" have notes at the foot of the study page, with a separate classroom text, which aids so much in improving translation work.

USE SOME OR ALL OF THE **Lake Latin Series**
FOR BETTER RESULTS NEXT YEAR.

Inquiries Will Have Prompt Attention

Scott, Foresman & Co.

8-12 East 34th Street, NEW YORK

HOW THEY WERE MADE

The Exercises in the Revised Edition of **BARSS'S WRITING LATIN** were made in this way:

First, the sentence was written in Latin, with the aid of the *Lodge Vocabulary*, as:

Summo periculo, cives, hunc exercitui praeficietis.

Then this was translated:

"It will be extremely dangerous for you to place this man in command (with the highest danger will you place this one in command) of the army, citizens." (Book II, Ex. III, 14.)

The Latin original means that the sentence can certainly be done into Latin.

The words in parentheses do all that a book can do to teach the method of turning idiomatic English into Latin.

Furthermore, in both books the Special Vocabulary for each lesson are grouped by Parts of Speech, as an aid in reviewing.

Have you examined the revised editions of **BARSS'S WRITING LATIN, BOOKS I AND II?**

D. C. HEATH & COMPANY

Boston

New York

Chicago

At Private Sale

ROMAN COINS OF THE REPUBLIC AND THE EMPIRE

Covering the period from B. C. 268 to about A. D. 300. Splendid series of Consular Silver; Coins of all the early Emperors in Gold, Silver and Copper.

Price List may be had.

Of Special Interest to Students of Roman History and the Latin Language.

WAYTE RAYMOND

200 Fifth Avenue

Room 960

New York

The Latin Games

Game of the Latin Noun, new; may be played by all grades including beginners. Price, 50 cents.

Verb Games, a series of five games, each 29c.; 1 and 2, on principal parts; 3 and 4, on verb forms; No. 5, on verb terminations.

Game of Latin Authors, price, \$1.04.

These games always please and profit; are highly recommended by teachers and pupils. Any or all sent postpaid on receipt of price. Stamps accepted.

THE LATIN GAME CO.

APPLETON, WIS.

Massawippi Summer School

(TENTH SEASON)

NORTH HATLEY, QUEBEC

Preparation for all School and College examinations. Special classes in Spanish and other modern languages (\$40 for 20 lessons).

North Hatley, situated on Lake Massawippi, is easily accessible from New York, Boston, and Montreal. The School makes possible, for both adults and young people, a wholesome and pleasant summer combined with effective and systematic study.

For booklet, address

JOHN P. RICE

(Asst. Prof. of Romance Languages, Williams College)
WILLIAMSTOWN, MASS.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is published by The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, weekly, on Mondays from October 1 to May 31 inclusive, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday, at Barnard College, Broadway and 120th St., New York City.

All persons within the territory of the Association who are interested in the language, the literature, the life and the art of ancient Greece and ancient Rome, whether actually engaged in teaching the Classics or not, are eligible to membership in the Association. Application for membership may be made to the Secretary-Treasurer, Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York. The annual dues (which cover also the subscription to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY) are two dollars. Within the territory covered by the Association (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia) subscription is possible to individuals only through membership in The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. To institutions in this territory the subscription price is one dollar per year. Outside the territory of the Association the subscription price of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is one dollar per year. If affidavit to bill for subscription is required, the fee must be paid by the subscriber. Subscribers in Canada or other foreign countries must send 30 cents extra for postage.

Managing Editor

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, Columbia University

Associate Editors

WALTON B. MCDANIEL, University of Pennsylvania
DAVID M. ROBINSON, The Johns Hopkins University
B. L. ULLMAN, University of Pittsburgh
H. H. YEAMES, Hobart College

Communications, articles, reviews, books for review, queries, etc., inquiries concerning subscriptions and advertising, back numbers or extra numbers, notices of change of address, etc., should be sent to Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York City.

Single copies, 10 cents. Extra numbers, 10 cents each, \$1.00 per dozen.

Printed by W. F. Humphrey, 300 Pulteney St., Geneva, N. Y.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE ATLANTIC STATES

Organized in November, 1906
Membership April 30, 1916—725

Dues - - - - - \$2.00 per annum
(The year runs from May 1 to April 30)

President

PROFESSOR CHARLES E. BENNETT,
Cornell University

Secretary-Treasurer

PROFESSOR CHARLES KNAPP,
Barnard College, New York City

Vice-Presidents

Professor Harold L. Cleasby, Syracuse University.
Professor Catharine Saunders, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Mr. W. W. King, Barringer High School, Newark, N. J.
Miss Jessie E. Allen, Girls' High School, Philadelphia, Pa.
Professor Evan T. Sage, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Professor Elisha Conover, Delaware College, Newark, Del.
Miss Mary B. Rockwood, Western High School, Baltimore, Md.
Professor Charles S. Smith, George Washington University, D. of C.

BURTON'S LATIN GRAMMAR

CLEAR AND SIMPLE
COMPLETE AND SCHOLARLY

A grammar which treats Latin as a living language, with the result that the pupil acquires the feeling that Latin is not a series of fixed forms but a language that has really been spoken by living people.

A grammar which is something more than a reference book. It presents no bewildering complexities of exceptional and never-used rules. Each rule is accompanied by few and well-chosen illustrations. It groups together the hitherto scattered verbs, such as demonstrative, iterative, etc. It fully emphasizes English derivatives with every part of speech.

337 PAGES

\$1.00

Silver, Burdett & Company

Boston

New York

Chicago

A New Product Breasted's Ancient History

Wall Maps

Write for further particulars

DENOYER-GEPPERT CO.

School Map Publishers

460 East Ohio Street

CHICAGO

W. F. HUMPHREY

300-312 Pulteney St. GENEVA, N. Y.

BOOK, CATALOG, MAGAZINE
AND BOOKLET PRINTING

Special attention given to technical and
scientific publications and pamphlets

THE COMPLETE PLANT
ESTABLISHED 1885